

**THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

WILLIAM SELTZER, JR., :  
Plaintiff, :  
vs. : CIVIL ACTION 07-0219-KD-C  
OFFICER KERSEY, et al., :  
Defendants. :

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

Plaintiff, a Mobile County Metro Jail prison inmate proceeding *pro se*, filed a complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 together with a Motion to Proceed Without Prepayment of Fees. This action was referred to the undersigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 72.2(c)(4), and is now before Court for plaintiff's failure to comply with the Court's order and to prosecute this action.

On August 28, 2007, plaintiff was ordered to file an amended complaint on or before September 24, 2007. (Doc. 8) Plaintiff's court-ordered amended complaint would have superseded his original complaint and amendments and clarified his claims, and corrected the deficiencies that the Court pointed out to him in his pleading of his claims. Plaintiff was warned that his failure to comply with the Court's order within the prescribed time would result in the dismissal of his action. (Doc. 8) Plaintiff, however,

has not filed an amended complaint as ordered. Furthermore, plaintiff's copy of the Court's order has not been returned to the Court, nor has he taken any other action in regard to this order.

Due to Plaintiff's failure to comply with the Court's order and to prosecute this action, and upon consideration of the alternatives that are available to the Court, it is recommended that this action be dismissed without prejudice pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure as no other lesser sanction will suffice. *Link v. Wabash R.R.*, 370 U.S. 626, 630 (1962); *Zocaras v. Castro*, 465 F.3d 479, 484 (11th Cir. 2006); *World Thrust Films, Inc. v. International Family Entertainment, Inc.*, 41 F.3d 1454, 1456-57 (11th Cir. 1995); *Mingo v. Sugar Cane Growers Co-op*, 864 F.2d 101, 102 (11th Cir. 1989); *Goforth v. Owens*, 766 F.2d 1533, 1535 (11th Cir. 1985); *Jones v. Graham*, 709 F.2d 1457, 1458 (11th Cir. 1983); *Hildebrand v. Honeywell, Inc.*, 622 F.2d 179, 181 (5th Cir. 1980).<sup>1</sup> *Accord Chambers v. NASCO, Inc.*, 501 U.S. 32, 55 (1991) (finding that federal courts' inherent power to manage their own proceedings authorized the imposition of attorney's fees and related expenses as a sanction); *Malautea v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 987 F.2d 1536, 1545-46 (11th Cir.) (ruling that the court's inherent power to manage actions before it permitted the imposition of fines), *cert. denied*, 510 U.S. 863 (1993).

---

<sup>1</sup>The Eleventh Circuit in *Bonner v. City of Prichard*, 661 F.2d 1206, 1209 (11th Cir. 1981) (*en banc*), adopted as binding precedent the decisions of the former Fifth Circuit rendered prior to October 1, 1981.

The attached sheet contains important information regarding objections to this Report and Recommendation.

DONE and ORDERED this 12th day of October, 2007.

s/WILLIAM E. CASSADY  
**UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

**MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S EXPLANATION OF PROCEDURAL RIGHTS AND  
RESPONSIBILITIES FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATION, AND  
FINDINGS CONCERNING NEED FOR TRANSCRIPT**

1. ***Objection.*** Any party who objects to this recommendation, or anything in it, must, within ten days of the date of service of this document, file specific written objections with the Clerk of this Court. Failure to do so will bar a *de novo* determination by the district judge of anything in the recommendation and will bar an attack, on appeal, of the factual findings of the Magistrate Judge. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); *Lewis v. Smith*, 855 F.2d 736, 738 (11th Cir. 1988); *Nettles v. Wainwright*, 677 F.2d 404 (5th Cir. Unit B, 1982)(*en banc*). The procedure for challenging the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge is set out in more detail in SD ALA LR 72.4 (June 1, 1997), which provides that:

A party may object to a recommendation entered by a magistrate judge in a dispositive matter, that is, a matter excepted by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A), by filing a "Statement of Objection to Magistrate Judge's Recommendation" within ten days after being served with a copy of the recommendation, unless a different time is established by order. The statement of objection shall specify those portions of the recommendation to which objection is made and the basis for the objection. The objecting party shall submit to the district judge, at the time of filing the objection, a brief setting forth the party's arguments that the magistrate judge's recommendation should be reviewed *de novo* and a different disposition made. It is insufficient to submit only a copy of the original brief submitted to the magistrate judge, although a copy of the original brief may be submitted or referred to and incorporated into the brief in support of the objection. Failure to submit a brief in support of the objection may be deemed an abandonment of the objection.

A magistrate judge's recommendation cannot be appealed to a Court of Appeals; only the district judge's order or judgment can be appealed.

2. ***Transcript (applicable Where Proceedings Tape Recorded).*** Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915 and FED.R.CIV.P. 72(b), the Magistrate Judge finds that the tapes and original records in this case are adequate for purposes of review. Any party planning to object to this recommendation, but unable to pay the fee for a transcript, is advised that a judicial determination that transcription is necessary is required before the United States will pay the cost of the transcript.

s/WILLIAM E. CASSADY  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE